

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-13 and 15-22 are pending in this application. Claim 5 and 14 have been cancelled. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 are amended, and claim 22 is added.

Reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants greatly appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Chieu in the December 9, 2003 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,974,219 to Fujita in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,701,383 to Russo; and claims 3, 7, 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Russo and U.S. Patent No. 6,052,508 to Mincy. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed in the personal interview, none of the applied art discloses a system that uses structured representations to index recordings of activity comprising a user input, wherein said input is at least one input capable of receiving or conveying information between a user and the system, other than at least one audio/visual recorder input or a recording device located internal to a presentation device, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in new claim 22.

Instead, Russo merely discloses a video time-shifting system (Abstract); Fujita merely discloses a video image editing system (Abstract; col. 4, line 62); and Mincy merely discloses the digital capture of both video and audio information (Abstract). Cruz discloses recording sources, such as audio recorders, video camcorders, and an electronic whiteboard, however

Cruz requires the recording sources be located internal to a presentation device (col. 5, lines 51-54).

None of the applied art discloses input/output devices including a display device, such as a television, monitor or touch screen, a slide projector, a printer, a speaker, a mouse, a keyboard, an electronic pen, or any other device capable of receiving or conveying information between a user and the system that is not internal to a presentation device. Moreover, unlike Cruz, which requires a device located internal to a presentation device, in the present invention any accommodation of known or later-developed input/output devices could be used provided the selected components allow for capturing of a particular activity. Furthermore, unlike the applied art, the device with which the user interacts to enter or indicate an index item can include, but is not limited to, a keyboard, a mouse, a joystick, a touch screen, an electronic pen, a track ball, a touch pad, or the like.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and new claim 22 are distinguishable over the applied art. Accordingly, prompt allowance of claims 1 and 22 is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, none of the applied art discloses a method of using structured representations to represent recordings of activity, comprising the step of monitoring the at least one index and indicating when the at least one item has begun recording, as recited in claim 10.

Instead, Fujita merely discloses that when a user finds a desirable scene while observing a display of a monitor, the user clicks the mark setting button to set a mark (col. 11, lines 54-61). Cruz merely synchronizes individual records of visual or audio recordings in time (col. 5, lines 62-65), probably requiring a time code. Similarly, Russo and Mincy fail to disclose the above recited feature of amended claim 10.

Thus, none of the applied art can moderate index recordings and indicate an at least one index is being recorded once the index has begun recording. As discussed above, the applied art either requires a user to set a mark setting button or a time code in order to synchronize recordings.

Moreover, the above recited features have significant advantages over the conventional art. For instance, during a meeting with an agenda including a specific number of items a participant may be called out of the meeting, and thus miss items that were on the agenda and recorded. The above discussed features, allow for each item on the agenda to be "checked", by a moderator, as each item on the agenda comes up for review and is recorded. Following the meeting, the participant can select the agenda items that were missed.

As such, the applied art fails to disclose all of the features of the claimed invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is distinguishable over the applied art. Furthermore, claims 11-13, 15-21 and 23 which depend from claim 10, are likewise distinguishable over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jude L. Cooney
Registration No. 54,045

JAO:JLC/dap

Date: January 20, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--